COMPLAINTS AND QUERIES VPON ENGLANDS Misery:

Acted Octob. 13, 1659.

BY SOME

OFFICERS OF THE ARMY,

AGAINST

The Parliament of the Common-wealth of ENGLAND.

By a true Lover of the LAWES *and* LIBERTIES *of* ENGLAND. E. D.

LONDON, *Printed by* J. C. 1659.

YALE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

COMPLAINTS *and* QUERIES *upon* Englands *Misery*, *acted* Octob. 13 1659.

Complaint.

O How dolefully different is this day from this day sevennight? when Parliament, and Councel of State, Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common-Council of the City of *London*, with the Officers of the Army, met at their sacred Solemn devotions of singing, praying, prayſing and preaching the praiſes of God, for the late deliverance from the Northweſt Inſurrection; marching afterwards in great State with ſound of Trumpets, attendance of Armed Souldiers, and aſpect of innumerable people, to a moſt ſumptious Dinner, where they eat and drank of all choiſe varieties and rarities, with great welcome, and rare Muſick, and all interchangeable ſigns and ſignifications, of integrated unity and amity. *But now* the Army hath (they ſay) *diſſolved* the Parliament; *And* is not this daies ſorrow far greater then that daies joy; ſad enough to break more hearts then on that day were made merry?

Query. Say ye the Parliament is *diſſolved*, How can that be, when by an Act of the people in *Parliament*, this Parliament was never to be diſſolved, without an Act of their own. Nor did thoſe Repreſentatives of the the people of *England* ever conſent to their diſſolution? So that let come never ſo many pretended Parliaments, Conventions, Forms pretending Supream Power; yet will not the ſupremacy of this Parliament ſtill impend over them? Will not the Authority of this Parliament be ſtill in force, to call all the ſaid Pretentioners to an accompt, and to ſtick in their ſides, when ever the free people of *England*, (continually watching their opportunitys) ſhall bring them back to ſit in Parliament?

Compl. However, if the Army have not *diſſolved*, yet ſure enough they have *interrupted*, and put off the Parliament; which is ſad enough. It being all one with *not having a remedy*, as not to have *Liberty to uſe it*: So that the cry of the good people is; The Parliament is gone, and we in probability for ever undone.

Quære. Whether we ſhall do well, ſo to conclude? For did they not ſo once afore, in *Olivers* time; ſome of them aſſiſting him in that evil, others of the Army afterwards, ſtrengthning him keeping out the Parliament till many of the Commander, and ſome of the Souldiers troubled in Conſcience left the Army; and others ſo manifeſted their diſſatisfaction, that they were lifted out by *Oliver*? And is not this laſt evil in this ſecond interruption greater then the former? And therefore like to cry lowder againſt their Conſciences, to cauſe them (if God pleaſe) to return? I ſay, I Query whether this ſecond interruption be not greater then the former, all things conſidered? For, did not the remaining Officers of the Army (pretending to godlineſs) refuſe to take warning of treaſuring up an evil Conſcience, by the trouble of Conſcience that befel the others? Did they not aſſiſt in the Proclaiming *Richard* Protector? not knowing any ſufficient ground? And had they not the patience, and connivance at leaſt, if not giving ſome aſſiſtance to the ſaid *Richards* calling a *Free Pauliament* (as they named it); ſo *free*, that beſides (through notorious patching and ſhuffling) the moſt of them were

Engliſh

English Cavelleers, arch Royalists; there were called in 60 *Scottish* and *Irish* Representatives; against all Law, Custome, Ordinance or shew of Authority whatsoever; to the dangerous prejudice of this Nation of *England* (they being a third part more then the *Quorum* of an English Parliament) able to make Lawes upon us without our consents, if at any time 40 of ours should not be in the House?

And moreover did not the complexion of that Parliament (as they call it) appear as looking towards a Kings At least did not the Army suspect so much, whereby they feared the reverting of Kings, Queens, Lands, and Fee-Farm Rents? And did not the Officers of the Army upon these and the like considerations, set forth in Print their repentance for all their aforesaid evils, of *May* 6, 1659. Saying, 'The publick concernment of this Commonwealth being through a vicisitude of dangers and 'back-slidings of many brought into that state and posture wherein they now stand, 'AND OUR SELVES also contributing thereunto, by wandering divers wayes, 'from righteous and equal paths; and also observing to our great grief that the 'good SPIRIT which formerly appeared amongst us in the carrying on of this 'great work did daily decline, so as the GOOD OLD CAUSE became a reproach, &c.? And did not they and some of the former Commanders troubled in Conscience as aforesaid joyning with them, earnestly intreat in the said Printed Declaration, ('That this Parliament formerly interrupted by *Oliver*) would return to the exercise and discharge of their trust, promising them (in the said Declaration) that they 'would be ready in their places, as becomes them to yield them their utmost assistance to sit in safety, in setling and securing the peace and freedom of this Commonwealth.

And when this Parliament with much self-denial, ventured themselves divers ways to sit and act, and now the conscentious Officers that afore relinquished, or were ejected out of Command are restored to their respective Commands; did not the generallity of both sorts of the Officers aforesaid, (all pretending to godliness) now again stop this Parliament from going to the House, and therein seem to vomit up their repentance (repenting of that repentance) and to lick up that Vomit which formerly they had spewed out. And did not the Same men herein fare worse then before; not onely in transgressing against their former self-conviction, former examples of Conscience, former repentings, former repentance of their indangering the whole Commonwealth, but against the Sage Patriots of their Countrey and pious (for the Generallity) towards God, and some of them brave Souldiers; and that after they had sat half a year, mainly doing their Drudgery, getting Laws of Excise and Custom, raising Taxes, and paying Souldiers by Sea and Land? Yea in the very Act of stopping the Speaker in Kings-street, when a Lieut. Col. bussling in the business, was asked why he did these things? Did he give any other answer, but this? That he had received a Command so to do. And doth not such an answer as this make a considered man astonished what might be the GODLINESS (so much cryed up) of a Souldier, that out of the business of War, and resistance of the *Supream Legislative Power* obey an unrighteous command (his Conscience being witness) without dispute.

Compl. They were necessiated (they say) thus to stop the Parliament, for *self-preservation.*

Quary. Is there any doubt but that *self* was mainly in it? But is there any necessi-

? Can there be any neceſſity (if we believe that GOD Governs the World) of ſinning? Or was there ſuch a ſtreſs to be put upon Nine Mens loſing their Commiſſions, wherein were imbarked onely a little *future* ayry *honour*, and durty *riches*, they having had enough already to make them of Low-men to live like Lords? Or is not the truth of the ſtorie, that they brought themſelves into that dammage, if they count it ſo great a dammage, as to tear up all, rather then to fall into it? For, did not fourty Commanders of the North-Weſt expedition preſently after their compaſſing things about *Cheſter*, ſubſcribe a Petition, or ſome ſuch paper to have a Generall, and generall Officers? And when the Parliament (having private notice of it) Voted that the granting that requeſt was *Needleſs*, *Chargeable*, and *Dangerous* to the Common-wealth, did not 230 Officers anon after ſubſcribe a *Repreſentation* and Petition, wherein (beſides many ſhrew'd reflexions on the Parliament hinted, as it were of their *ingratitude*, their *oblique admonitions* of the Army, *&c*:) deſiring of the Parliament nine Propoſals; in the ſixt and ſeventh whereof they Petition that no Officer might be put into the Army but by a Committe of *Nomination*, nor put out of the Army without a due proceeding at their Court Martial; and in the eigth they neatly couch that their Commander in cheife might be more fixed in his Commiſſion, then the condition of the Parliament it ſelf was, according to a certain Vote that they had formerly paſſed, touching the length of their ſitting? And were not theſe Propoſals obvious to be interpreted (as ſome did interpret them) That the Army cold better truſt the ſaid Committe of Nomination, and Court Martial, then the Parliament; and looked more after their own Eſtabliſhment then that of the Parliament? And to graſpe at a power to change the Complexion of the Army (the Parliaments Servants,) as they the Officers ſhould ſee cauſe, without the Cognizance of the Parliament their Maſter? Yet becauſe in the ſaid paper of Propoſals they did ſo often mention themſelves to be the Parliaments *faithfull Servants* (which title did they make good) did not the Parliament ſtrein hard to ſqueeſe out ſo much out 'of the ſaid paper as to give them thanks for the good *expreſſions* of their affections, 'and faithfulneſs; and to tell them they had already taken into conſideration ſome 'of the particulars in the ſaid Repreſentation; and that they would the reſt on *Saturday* next? And did not the Parliament keep their promiſe? And within few dayes were come to the ſixt Propoſall afore-named? But mean while, did not nine of their Officers, not ſtaying for the Parliaments anſwer ſubſcribe a Letter, ſending it about to the reſt to ſubſcribe it, to be ſen to the Army in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, that the Officers in both theſe places might ſubſcribe to the ſaid Repreſentation and Propoſall, which, with the ſaid Letter (mentioned therein) they accordingly ſent the ſaid Letter? which attempt did it ſignifie leſs then that they were reſolved here in *England* to adhere (and to get the reſt in *Scotland* and *Ireland* to adhere if they could) to thoſe Propoſalls what ever anſwer the Pa liament ſhould give them? This originall Letter with the ſaid nine hands, being brought by a Commander to whom it was ſent to ſubſcribe, unto the Parliament, was it not a ſufficient cauſe to make the Parliament the ſame day it was brought in, after long debate (for they ſat late) to vote the Commiſſions of thoſe nine Officers voyd? And thereby to experience whether the Army, or Parliament were in chiefe rule? And whether the Parliament were not better to dye in honour, then to live and looſe their Authority? Now doth this ſtory merit ſuch a *ſelf preſervation*, as muſt be attained with an univerſall deſolation of the ſafety of three Nations? Are nine mens pomp and riches, or rather only the continuance

tinuance of addition of those two (for there was nothing but parchment voted away from them) balanceable against the peace and prosperity of three Nations? If they say anon the Parliament might vote out nine more and nine, &c, &c: Is this imaginably possible (unless so many would be as disobedient as the first nine) seeing the Parliament cannot be without an Army? And could the Officers of the Army, yea and some of the said ejected Officers brook it to be uncommissionated by *Oliver* or the other so dealt with from time to time for their faithfulness to the Parliament; and are they now affraid to be voted out of Commission from time to time, whilst they stand faithfull to the Parliament? If they say (as some of them did that *Octob.* 13.) that they were forced so to rout or stop the Parliament, *that they might know whether they were to live or dye*: Is not this a strange Cimæra, phantisied meerly in the braine, unbecomming men of valour, that had so often boldly looked death in the face? Had the Parliament had that in their hearts, might they not as easily have voted them to be seised upon? Did this Parliament execute the King without unkinging of him; and could they not imprison or punish Commanders of an Army, without first uncommissionating them? Did not therefore these Officers in opposing the Parliaments sitting, seek a self-preservation rather from their own jealousies, then real dangers? However, may not any *Malefactor* as Lawfully, if not more Lawfully, offer violence to an Officer of the Magistate, sent by authority to arrest, or imprison that Malefactor, alleadging he did it out of *Self-preservation?*

Compl. But they did put this cessation upon the Parliament (as they say themselves) for another reason, *viz*: because the voting out of nine Officers at once did *put a disreputation upon the Army.*

Que. Did not the Earl of *Essex* and hundreds of men of quality submit to the Parliament to be laid aside and took it not to heart, as these men have done? Were they not rather honoured for their self-deniall.

Que. Did not *Oliver* do neer as much at one time; and much more at severall times to the value of an 100? Yet had they any courage on that juster occasion, to extricate and deliver themselves? Yea could this one act, and but once acted since the Parliament sate, in slightly punishing nine for disobedience to them, put a disrepute on an Army of 5 or 6000? Did not they in their Address to *Richard* delivered (the former convention sitting in Parliament as they called it) importune that *all Unworthy men should be removed*, in what place soever they were, whether among *themselves* or &c: and then thought it no disrepute to the Armie? If they say, but those they meant were indeed unworthy, but not the said nine: then the query will be, whether the Parliament are meetest to be the judge of that, or the Army; yea those nine, and that in their own case? But the maine query touching this complaint of *disreputation* is, whether the revenge or remedy they took, in interrupting the Parliament of *England* (called together this second time by their own intreaty) were the right ready way to cure that their supposed disrepute? Or rather was not a direct course to accumulate more, and worse reproach upon themselves the longest day they have to live, in the eyes of all true English-men? and to leave it on record when they are dead in the *Chronicles of England?* Yea have not this supposed cure, wounded the repute and hearts of all the sober Godly people of *England* that adhered to the Parliament, by the taunts of Enemies at home, crying to them, *where is now your Parliament?* and by the rejoycings of the Enemie abroad in all Nations round about us, animated (in all likelyhood) hereby to invade us? yea whether the Officers by this

breakin

breaking off of Parliament have not rendered themselves a scorn to their own Soldiers whiles they now jeer, saying, *every month, or quarter they have a new Master?*

Compl. Others say, shall the Parliament *Vote all the Godly out of the Army?*

Querie. Are those nine *all* your *Godly ones?* Yea are those nine *all Godly?* Cold we ever heare, or learne so much touching some of them, though it would have been joy to us to have heard it? Is not he Godly that *doth* Godly, *Tit.* 1. 11. 12? Or can true *Godliness be seperated from Righteousness* by the same place? Or is *he a Righteous man, that doth not that which is Righteous*, 1 Joh. 3. 7? Or are these *violences* against the grand Government of a Nation, the *fruits of Godliness*, Jam. 3. 17? Is this to *Learn meekness of Christ* as we are commanded, *Math.* 11. 29? Do Soldiers herein as becomes Godly ones, obey the Command of God, *Luk.* 3. 14? *And* John Baptist *said to the Soldiers Do violence to no man; neither accuse any falsly, and be content with your wages*? Is this according to that rule, Dearly beloved, *Avenge not your selves*, Rom. 12. 19? Can men be *Godly according to the first Table, whilst unrighteous according to the* second Table, *Jam.* 2. 10. Must these nine *Godly ones* (if so) be redressed at no cheaper a rate, then by pulling up the Foundation of the ancient only supream Authority of this Nation, to the great grief of thousands of *Godly people*, to the stopping of the Trade of thousands of *Tradesmen*; to the preventing the timely reliefe of thousands of poor Prisoners, Orphans, and Widdowes, for whom the Parliament were preparing to relieve them? Is this according to 1 *Joh.* 3. 16. *to lay down our lives for the Godly Brethren*? Or in it not rather like *Matchiavels* Maxim, *Let our friends Perish so as our Enemies perish together with them*? If ye from thence call to mind, and object your ventering your lives for the good people and Parliament of *England*; the query is, whether most of you did it not when ye had but little else to venter? And whether the Parliament and many of the good people of *England* did not venter their lives and great Estates, *viz*: hanging up and Confiscation, if the King had prevailed, besides ventering their lives (a many of them) in battle receiving many honourable wounds? And whether all the people of *England* have not well paid you ever since; thousands becomming very poor, to make you rich? And whether they making you their Servants, and thus daintily bringing you up, ye have not most ingratefully made your selves their Masters?

Compl, We will not, say others of them, serve the *Parliament*, or any *Forme, contrary to the Common main interest*, viz: Of *Freedome as Men*, and *Freedome as Christians.*

Querie. Touching *Libe ty as Christians*, that is *Liberty of Conscience*, what signes or tokens were there of the Parliaments infringing this? were there not many for one, in the Parliament for large Liberty of Conscience? Yea did they not manifest it in a *Resolve at a Committe for that purpose* (and 'tis in print) for a larger allowance of Liberty of Conscience then the Army Petitioned for? Let us set down both, word for word, and then see whose expressions for that thing are larger. The humble Petition and Address of the Officers of the Army, to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of *England*, *May* 12. 1659. Proposall the first. 'That all persons 'who profess Faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His Eternall Son, the true 'God, and in the holy Spirit', God coequall with the Father and the Son, one God blessed

blessed for ever, and do acknowledge the holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, to be the revealed, or written word or will of God, shall not be restrained from their profession, but have due encouragement and equal protection in the profession of their Faith, and exercise of Religion, whilst they abuse not this liberty to the civil injuries of others, or disturbance of others in their way of Worship: So that this Liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as shall practise, or hold forth licentiousness, or prophanness, under the profession of Religion. Thus the Army, in their Address aforesaid.

The Committee of Parliament for Government, October the 8th 1659. *Resolved, That the Supream deligated power is not intrusted to restrain the profession of any person, or persons who profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ God manifested in the Flesh, and in God the Holy Spirit, God blessed for evermore, And do acknowledge the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the revealed or written word, or will of God; but ought to give due encouragement, and equal protection to them in the profession of their Faith, and exercise of Religion, whilst they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others, or disturbance of others, in their way of Worship,* Thus the Commttee of Parliament.

Now the Quæry is, Whether the Committee doth not expres themselves in larger and softer termes for Liberty of Conscience, then the said Officers of the Army? And if any Reader cannot perceive it; Whether if he as a *Quaker* or a *Socinian* (to name no more, though more might be named) according to what hath been truly recited out of the said printed Copies) Whether we had not rather subscribe to that of the *Committee*, then to that of the *Officers of the Army*? Yea 'tis quæried further, whether this were the way to secure Liberty of Conscience, to disperse the Parliament, the only Legislative power to restrain the Adversaries of Liberty of Conscience, by a Law to give way to the said Liberty? Yea, whether whilst we look on the present, and former breaches made on Parliaments, and invasion of worse things in their room, ushered in commonly with a cry for *Liberty of Conscience*, do not render this cry very suspicious, that it is used only as a *Visard* to palliat every ugly design?

2. *Touching Liberty as men*, that is of our *persons*. that we be not unlawfully imprisoned, and of our *Purses and Estates*, thar they be not drained by illegall, lawless Taxes, and of our Familes, that they be not molested with force and Free-quarter upon and in our Houses, and upon which the Quære is, whether the way to attain this Liberty securely be, to take off the Parliament, (the only Legal Assertor of that Liberty) whilst there are 3 great Armies in *England*, *Scotland* and *Ireland*, that must (or at least will) be maintained? Yea, are not the Commanders of the Army by this course, in a fair way to make their Children, yea and themselves too, very slaves, in case they leave the Army, or the Army leaves them, and leave us in this condition?

3. Touching non-serving the *Parliament*, or any *Form*, conttary to the said two Liberties; This quæry is, Whether the common use of this word *Form*, (of late years) in a disdainful sence, be not a Satanical invention, and Engine to keep men off at large, from any thing that should bound them to a closer conscientions walking, despisig all wayes of Worship as *Forms*, contemning Parliaments

ny the Power thereof, whether this be to obey the *Form of Doctrine* (Rom. 6. 17.) the *Form of sound words* (2 *Tim.* 1. 13.) continued in the Scriptures a which Command (1 *Pet.* 2. 13.) *To submit to every Ordinance of man* (*in things Civil*) *for Conscience sake* ? Much more to a Parliament that is above Kings ? And threatens us (*Rom.* 13. 1, 2.) *That if we resist the* HIGHER *Powers, we resist the Ordinance of* GOD ; *and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation* ? Now is there any *more natural and Genuine* HIGHEST *Power, than a Parliament chosen by the People, in whom the Original of Supream Power is radicated* ? Quæry further, whether, though in some things there may be a *form without substance*, there can be any *visible substance or Action without its Form* ? As, can there be Fire without Heat, Water without liquidity, kinds of Beasts and Birds and men without variety of Forms, True godliness without some Form of profession, a fighting Army without some form of Battallio ? A Government set up by the people over themselves without a Parliament (or call it what ye will) that doth present the people, by the peoples choyse, and consent ? And is not the Peoples Agreement how they will be governed, a *Fundamental Form* of Government, both *Intrinsical* to the *Constitution* and *Extrinsical* to the *Execution* of the *Legislative part* ?

Comp. Others say this Parliament, consisting of these men, *are not fit to a rule, as not refined enough* ; *and therefore a more refined party is fitter for it.* Not to excuse the want of that goodness as was desirable in some 3 or 4 of them ; were not the generality of them learned, pious, Godly men, for men of that rank and quality ? If notwithstanding, the Officers of the Army and their Adherents, knowing them (I suppose) by name, would call them into the House, doth it not probably signifie, that they called them to sit, only to do their *drudgerie*, viz : To *out* Mr. *Richard*, to clear the way (for I know not who ;) to make an *Act of Indemnity for the Army* ; to lay *two Taxes* to be paid within half a year, *to pay the Soldiery and Seamen* ; to make *two Acts*, the one for payment of excise, the other for payment of Customs, for them whom the Army should after thrust into Government to gather up ; dismissing this Parliament under the great *odium of the people* in the three Nations ? It is queered further, if never so refined a party as can be had (afore Christ come, and make all the Inhabitants of the Earth perfect Saints) should take upon them, the supream Legislative power and rule, can they allow more *Liberty of Conscience*, then aforesaid ? Can they *defray the Commonwealths charges* with less Taxes then will maintaine a *strong Fleet at Sea, and pay 3 huge Armies* in *England Scotland* and *Ireland* ? or can they rule justly *without punnishing Offenders* ? If they cannot ; where is the *refined difference* ? yea where will there be any *Bassis* or *Bottom* of that *refined Government* if the *peoples consent Concurre not to their sitting* ? And if their consent doth not Concurre, where is our *Civil Liberty as men*, and our *Liberty of Conscience* as Christians, liable to be imposed upon, to submit to we know not what refined Phantasies.

FINIS.